Entropy as an adiabatic invariant

Note: This short article was submitted to Nature Physics as a Correspondence. The intention was to provide a brief albeit significant criticism of the work of J. Dunkel and S. Hilbert, *Consistent Thermostatistics Forbids Negative Absolute Temperatures*, Nature Physics **10**, (2014). The respected editor decided not to publish the Correspondence. We have therefore decided to submit the paper to arXiv. Comments/criticisms are welcomed, particularly from the authors of the mentioned paper.

arXiv:1607.05322v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 18 Jul 2016

To the editor — Recently Dunkel and Hilbert[1] have argued that the consistency relation $T(\partial S/\partial A_\mu)_E = -(\partial E/\partial A_\mu)_S = -\langle \partial H/\partial A_\mu \rangle$ favors the Gibbs entropy (S_G) over the Boltzmann entropy (S_B) since this relation is satisfied if and only if S is an adiabatic invariant. The first equality follows simply from invertibility of entropy $S(E, A_\mu) \to E(S, A_\mu)$; however, the second equality is rooted in assuming that a mechanical adiabatic process is equivalent to a slow thermodynamic adiabatic process. For a mechanical adiabatic process one can write $\langle \mathrm{d}H/\mathrm{d}t \rangle = \mathrm{d}E/\mathrm{d}t = \sum_\mu \langle \partial H/\partial A_\mu \rangle \, \mathrm{d}A_\mu/\mathrm{d}t$. On the other hand, for a thermodynamic adiabatic process ($\mathrm{d}S/\mathrm{d}t = 0$), one can write $\mathrm{d}E/\mathrm{d}t = \sum_\mu (\partial E/\partial A_\mu)_S \mathrm{d}A_\mu/\mathrm{d}t$. The equivalence of these two leads to the second relation in the "consistency relation", i.e. $(\partial E/\partial A_\mu)_S = \langle \partial H/\partial A_\mu \rangle$. As is well-known N is an important thermodynamic variable, which contributes to the total energy through chemical work, $đW = \mu \mathrm{d}N$, through the intensive parameter of chemical potential, $\mu \equiv (\partial E/\partial N)_S$. In fact in the Supplementary Information, Dunkel and Hilbert explicitly mention that A_μ can be an external parameter, *"such as volume, particle number, magnetic field strength, etc"*[1]. Here we note that such a relation fails to hold for the important parameter $A_\mu = N$ even when S is chosen to be the Gibbs entropy. In other words we show that thermodynamic chemical potential $\mu_{th} = (\partial E/\partial N)_S = -T(\partial S/\partial N)_E$ is not the same as "mechanical" chemical potential $\mu_m = \langle \partial H/\partial N \rangle$. This lack of consistency remains true regardless of choice of entropy S_G or S_B. We therefore argue that the consistency relation is invalid and should not be used to argue in favor of one entropy (S_G) over the other (S_B).

To see that the consistency relation is invalid for $S = S_G = \ln\{\mathrm{Tr}[\Theta(E - H)]\}$, for $A_\mu = N$, one must simply realize that the trace operation (or integration in phase space for classical systems) is not interchangeable with differentiation with respect to N, as the degrees of freedom of a quantum or classical system (which determines the dimension of phase space in classical system), crucially depends on N. This interchangeability is assumed to always hold true (for any allowed A_μ) by Dunkel and Hilbert in order to prove the consistency relation for S_G[1]. To see the above argument more explicitly note that in the microcanonical ensemble, $\langle \partial H/\partial N \rangle \equiv \mathrm{Tr}[\partial H/\partial N \; \delta(E - H)]/\omega = -\mathrm{Tr}[\partial \Theta(E - H)/\partial N]/\omega$, where $\omega = \mathrm{Tr}[\delta(E - H)]$. On the other hand, $T_G(\partial S_G/\partial N)_E = (\partial S_G/\partial N)_E/(\partial S_G/\partial E)_N = \partial/\partial N \, (\mathrm{Tr}[\Theta(E - H)])/\omega$. Therefore, one can see that the consistency relation holds only if one can move in the differentiation into the integration on state space, i. e. trace operation. This is clearly not allowed and has in fact been proved to be false in specific and explicit cases[2]. If one replaced Tr with $\int ... \int \mathrm{d}^{3N}p \mathrm{d}^{3N}q/h^{3N}$ for a classical system, the lack of interchangeability will become more evident.

As an example of why $\mu_{th} \neq \mu_m$, consider a simple classical ideal gas. It is well-known that the chemical potential of such a system is a large negative number $\mu_{th} = (\partial E/\partial N)_S << 0$[3]. On the other hand, the "mechanical" chemical potential $\mu_m = \langle \partial H/\partial N \rangle$ is clearly a nonnegative number as one can imagine by measuring the change of total energy by adding (a zero energy) particle.

We note that lack of validity of consistency relation is rooted in the assumption that a slow thermodynamical adiabatic process is equivalent to a mechanically adiabatic process, which is in turn rooted in a mechanical interpretation of thermodynamics. A mechanical adiabatic process is simply a slow process where $\mathrm{d}A_\mu/\mathrm{d}t$ is assumed to be very small. A thermodynamics adiabatic (and quasi-static) process is one which entropy remains constant. The main idea of Dunkel and Hilbert is that if entropy is a mechanical adiabatic invariant then the two processes are equivalent, i.e. $S =$const. However, we have argued that Gibbs entropy cannot be an adiabatic invariant with respect to N. Therefore, since N is a fundamental thermodynamic parameter, arguments based on mechanical properties of Gibbs entropy such as consistency and/or adiabatic invariance should be viewed with extra care. It is important to note that since consistency relation is in effect an equivalence relation between various energy terms, such as mechanical work or chemical work, it is important for all such terms to obey this equivalence. Therefore, if such equivalence breaks down for a given term (i.e. with respect to N), then the fundamental thermodynamic relation $\mathrm{d}E = T\mathrm{d}S - p\mathrm{d}V + \mu \mathrm{d}N + ...$ cannot have a mechanical analog even if S is considered to be an adiabatic invariant with respect to all but one energy term. In other word, since all systems of interest possess chemical potential, the lack of equivalence in this quantity casts doubt on the reliability of such consistency relation as a criterion to judge the validity of various entropy definitions.

Next, we address some potential objections. The entire formulation of the consistency relation is based on the microcanonical (entropy) representation where one assumes that $S = S(E, V, N, ...)$. Although the system is isolated or closed (i.e. fixed $E, V, N, ...$), one can clearly differentiate the entropy function with respect to its independent variables, i.e. $(\partial S/\partial N)_{E,V} = f(E, V, N)$. Otherwise,

intensive parameters such as temperature $T(E,V,N) = \{(\partial S/\partial E)_{V,N}\}^{-1}$ cannot be defined. Furthermore, differentiation with respect to discrete variables is a standard practice in thermodynamics[3]. Quantum mechanics teaches us that energy is *not* a continuous variable. However, for large macroscopic systems (and even otherwise), we perform partial differentiation with respect to energy since $(\Delta E/E) \to 0$. In much the same way, particle number is considered a continuous variable since $(\Delta N/N = 1/N) \to 0$. Therefore, one cannot exempt N from the requirement of consistency relation, $A_\mu = N$.

We end by making a general comment about the "mechanical foundation of thermodynamics". Thermodynamics is a formal theory based on lack of mechanical information about constituents of macroscopic systems, which naturally leads to the existence (and definition) of entropy. Mechanics, on the other hand, assumes availability of all relevant mechanical variables. Clearly, these two important theories are based on opposing set of assumptions. The insistence to base thermodynamics on a mechanical foundation has historically led to controversial issues, the most famous of which are thermodynamic irreversibility vs. mechanical reversibility as well as the problem of Maxwell's demon[3]. The work of Dunkel and Hilbert yet provides another example of how such an insistence leads to controversial and inconsistent results. We finally emphasize that our results should not be interpreted as favoring one entropy definition over another, but a critique of the so called "consistency" relation which equates mechanical and thermodynamical adiabatic processes.

References:
[1]Dunkel, J. & Hilbert, S. *Nature Phys.* **10**, 67–72(2014).
[2]Tavassoli, A. & Montakhab, A. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1512.02855(2015).
[3]Swendsen, R. H. *An Introduction to Statistical Mechanics and Thermodynamics*(Oxford University Press, 2012).

Afshin Montakhab* and Arash Tavassoli
Department of Physics, College of Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz 71946-84795, Iran
*email: montakhab@shirazu.ac.ir